

ADMINISTRATIVE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

6 JAN 1972

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Director-Comptroller

SUBJECT: Executive Development Plan

REFERENCE: (a) Memo for the Heads of Departments and Agencies from the Director, OMB dtd 14 Sep 71  
(b) Letter to the Director from the Chairman, CSC dtd 13 Sep 71

1. References concern the establishment of Executive Development Plans throughout the Federal Government. Mr. Hampton's letter was accompanied by guidelines to assist Federal agencies in meeting the administration objectives of planning and directing the execution of permanent Executive Development Systems.

2. In a short note to Mr. Colby you suggested that he talk with me before you discussed Mr. Hampton's letter with the Deputies. You stated in that note that you did not think we could just ignore Mr. Hampton's letter.

STATINTL

3. In my absence, Mr. [ ] talked with Mr. Colby and suggested that we prepare a brief resume of the guidelines presented by Mr. Hampton in his letter with an indication of where the Agency stands in relation to Mr. Hampton's proposals. Attached is such a resume. Sufficient copies are available in the event you wish to present this to the Deputies at a forthcoming meeting.

4. While the resume indicates that our personnel management programs track fairly well with the guidelines advanced by the Commission towards meeting the five major goals of a permanent Executive Development System, we recognize that there is still much to do. It does seem apparent, however, that our present Career Service structure, the established programs by which we can identify and develop promising executive talent, our training resources and the evaluative mechanisms available to Agency management provide much on which to build the kind of Executive Development System proposed in Mr. Hampton's letter.

5. It was also suggested to Mr. Colby that we prepare a reply to Mr. Hampton, explaining our career structure and the procedures by which we can achieve the objectives of the proposed Executive Development System. However, because a special meeting of the Interagency Advisory Group was to be convened for the sole purpose of discussing these proposals and the guidelines, we delayed further action until we could attend this meeting.

6. The Interagency Advisory Group Meeting has now been held. At the meeting, the Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission made it quite clear that the guidelines forwarded by Mr. Hampton are designed to be descriptive as opposed to proscriptive in nature, in that they consist of goals and objectives rather than specific regulations. Mr. Rosen assured the assembled Directors of Personnel that there is no intent to change existing structures where they are easily adapted to meet the requirements for an Executive Development System.

7. The timetable for the establishment of Executive Development Systems calls for the publishing of an internal policy statement and progress reports on 30 April 1972 and 30 September 1972. The progress reports require the names of the senior executives responsible for the implementation of the program in the Agency concerned and the number of potential mid-managers identified and that number's relationship to total population at the various grade levels.

8. At this point, I do not think it is necessary to reply directly to Mr. Hampton (in his letter, he merely invited comments concerning the proposal). Nor do I think it necessary to publish an internal policy statement; our basic regulations adequately support the concept of career development of our staff personnel to the executive level.

9. I do recommend that at the time of the initial report in April 1972 we forward a letter to the Commission providing general outlines of our career structure and our concept of career management with a brief narrative covering essentially the points set forth in the attached resume. In that letter we can inform the Commission how we hope to achieve the objectives of the proposed Executive Development System and we can also excuse ourselves from the more explicit requirements of subsequent program reports.

/s/Harry B. Fisher

Harry B. Fisher  
Director of Personnel

Distribution:

Orig. & X - Addressee  
1 - D/Pers Subject  
1 - D/Pers Chrono  
1 - JLO Chrono  
1 - DD/S

25X1A OD/Pers [redacted] :pjs (5 Jan 72)

Mr. Hampton, in his letter to the Director on 13 September 1971, asked that we join in Government-wide action to improve executive development programs. Acknowledging that agencies will need to take varying approaches, he stated five goals toward which all should aim and defined them both as objectives and as actions to be taken. Summarized below are the prescribed goals, with a statement of where the Agency stands in relation to each.

1. A high level of organizational commitment: Establish a policy supporting executive development; establish an Executive Manpower Resources Board (EMRB), chaired by a senior officer who reports to the agency head; and designate an Executive Manpower Management Officer (EMMO), normally the senior official concerned with personnel management.

We have the equivalent of an EMRB in the Deputies Meeting, chaired by the Executive Director-Comptroller; and a Director of Personnel whose responsibilities are in line with the EMMO role.

2. Development plans for each mid-manager of high potential and each incumbent executive: Develop programs that identify "comers" in the GS-13/15 range, and for them, and for each incumbent executive (supergrade), prepare individual development plans.

We are well along in this regard. Through the Personnel Management and Movement Program for the '70's project and on-going Career Board action, career services have identified their most promising people and have projected key replacement needs. Supergrades receive the close attention of Office Heads, Deputy Directors and the Director himself. Experience indicates that detailed individual development plans are impractical if projected beyond the immediate future.

3. Improved mobility programs: Establish organizational, occupational, and geographic mobility programs as a method of development, intra- and inter-Agency.

Movement is a way of life in this Agency, and mechanisms exist to generate and control it. A limited number of employees are detailed to other agencies, and within CIA an average of 110 to 120 officers at GS-14 and above are in rotational inter-Directorate assignments at any given time.

4. More effective training resource utilization: Agencies should review their use of opportunities for management training, both internal and external.

The Agency's record is good. In FY 1971 we sent 118 officers at GS-13 and above to external programs of management and executive development training, in addition to the much greater number who attended internal courses.

5. Improved development program evaluation: Review the effectiveness of evaluative mechanisms to assure achievement of development objectives.

Career service mechanisms, the Training Selection Board, the Personnel Management and Movement Program in the '70's project, the Deputies Meeting; these and other managerial activities provide both systems and procedures for the evaluation of our programs.